SCORING CRITERIA for RFA for the ASSETs Program

Effective Programmatic Components: Academic Assistance, Enrichment, & Family Literacy Needs Assessment

The applicant for the ASSETs grant is to explicitly describe the extent to which the program is designed established pursuant to the California Education Code, Sections 8420-8428, and the extent to which the planned elements of the academic and enrichment components are coordinated with the local assessment of expected schoolwide learning results and coordinated with the local single school plan for student achievement (SPSA).

Advanced (8)	Adequate (6)	Below or Partially Adequate (4)	Inadequate (0-2)
▪ Assessment of objective data very clearly defines the need for an after school program (may include before school, weekends, holiday and summer recess), evaluates community resources available, and convincingly documents how proposed program will address the needs and strengths of the school community in support of student achievement	▪ Some assessment of some objective data defines the need for a before and/or after school program (may include Saturday, holiday and summer recess), some available community resources are evaluated, and addresses how proposed program will address the needs and strengths of the school community in support of student achievement	▪ Minimal assessment of strengths & needs includes evidence from few sources with little data for students to be served or the needs and strengths of the school community.	▪ Inadequate assessment of strengths & needs with few sources and no data for students to be served
▪ Effective development of all program components, demonstration of ongoing collaboration with the school the students attend, and strategic efforts to integrate program proposal with critical data, school, district and community priorities, and the school plan for student achievement (SPSA).	▪ Limited development of all program components, plans to address ongoing collaboration with the school the students attend, and some integration with community priorities and the school plan for student achievement (SPSA).	▪ Few program components connected to assessed needs and strengths, minimal plan to address collaboration with each school the students attend, and some connection with school-wide planning and improvement efforts (SPSA).	▪ Fails to connect results to needs, no plan to collaborate with the school s the students attend, and little or no integration with school planning efforts
▪ Thoroughly addresses academic improvement needed to meet state standards in core academic subjects, graduation requirements, and in any additional areas identified by the comprehensive needs assessment.	▪ Addresses academic improvements needed to meet state and local standards in some core academic subjects and in some additional areas identified in assessment.	▪ Limited plan to address academic improvement; few State and local standards in academic subjects addressed.	▪ Inadequate plan to address academic improvement in areas identified in needs assessment
▪ Activities meet "principles of effectiveness" and scientifically-based research (see the glossary in Appendix A). Learning opportunities are locally assessed with effective performance measures to ensure high-quality results.	▪ Activities meet some "principles of effectiveness" and are based on performance measures aimed at ensuring high-quality academic enrichment opportunities and some research.	▪ Activities are not consistent with "principles of effectiveness," some connections to classroom learning, but minimally address individual student's assessed needs.	▪ Inadequate connection to classroom learning and fails to address individual student's needs
			"Effective Programmatic Components" continues to next page)

Effective Programmatic Components: Academic Assistance, Enrichment, & Family Literacy Needs Assessment

The applicant for the ASSETs grant is to explicitly describe the extent to which the program is designed established pursuant to the California Education Code, Sections 8420-8428, and the extent to which the planned elements of the academic and enrichment components are coordinated with the local assessment of expected schoolwide learning results and coordinated with the local single school plan for student achievement (SPSA).

Advanced (8)	Adequate (6)	Below or Partially Adequate (4)	Inadequate (0-2)
("Effective Programmatic Components" continued)			
▪ Multiple and strong points of evidence that program proposal is structured around research-based developmental framework that provides supports and opportunities to acquire personal and social assets (see Appendix B)	▪ Some points of evidence that program proposal is structured around research-based developmental framework that provides supports and opportunities to acquire personal and social assets (see Appendix B)	▪ Limited references found in proposed design to research-based developmental framework that provides supports and opportunities to acquire personal and social assets (see Appendix B)	▪ Inadequate indication that program proposal is based on research-based development framework for youths (see Appendix B)
▪ Effective system to determine need for family literacy services and other existing avenues to fill need. Effective plan for opportunities proposed.	▪ Some indication of system to determine need for family literacy services and other existing avenues to fill need. Plan proposed further development.	▪ Minimal assessment to determine need for family literacy services, minimal plan to provide opportunities for service	▪ Little or no effort to determine need for family literacy services, inadequate description of opportunities for service
▪ Clear plan to provides students with a wide variety of meaningful, age- and grade-appropriate opportunities that are aligned with the research-based framework for developmental assets and features of positive youth settings (see Appendix B); activities are clearly designed in relation to priorities identified in comprehensive needs assessment.	▪ Some indication that plans to provide students with interesting, age- and grade-appropriate academic and enrichment opportunities are aligned with needs assessment and research-based framework for developmental assets and features of positive youth settings (see Appendix B)	▪ Minimal evidence that program plan for academic and enrichment activities are age-and/ or grade-level appropriate. Minimal evidence that proposed program activities are aligned with findings of needs assessment and/or the research-based framework for developmental assets and features of positive youth settings (see Appendix B).	▪ Evidence is inadequate to determine that plan for academic and enrichment activities are age- or grade-level appropriate. Inadequate evidence that proposed program activities are aligned with needs assessment, research-based framework for developmental assets, and features of positive youth settings. (see Appendix B)
▪ Plan provides for meaningful involvement by youth in shared leadership in the research, design, implementation and evaluation of learning opportunities.	▪ Some evidence of ongoing plan to involve youth in selection, design, implementation, and evaluation of activities	▪ Minimal plan to involve youths in selection, design, and implementation of activities	▪ Inadequate involvement of youths in design and implementation of activities
▪ Initial projections for average costs per student per day are clearly justified in relation to complexity of program design and will decrease across time.	▪ Some evidence that initial projections for average costs per student per day relate to the complexity of program design and will decrease across time.	▪ Minimal indication that projections for average costs per student per day are reasonable relative to program design and will decrease across time	▪ Little indication that projections for average costs per student per day are relative to program design and will decrease across time

SCORING CRITERIA: RFA for California 21st Century High School After School (ASSETs) Program, Cohort 2, 2003-04

Effective Collaboration and Partnerships

The application is to explicitly describe the extent to which the program is established pursuant to the California Education Code, Sections 8420-8428, and is designed to be coordinated with the local single plan for student achievement (SPSA).

Advanced (4)	Adequate (3)	Below or Partially Adequate (2)	Inadequate (0-1)
▪ Effective plan for ongoing collaborative process and partnerships, which represent a wide variety of relevant and committed key stakeholders, builds upon existing collaboratives in school community, connects existing program strategies and provides a unified, integrated system of service.	▪ Plan for a collaborative process and the creation of partnerships, which represent relevant and committed key stakeholders. Some indication that plan builds upon existing collaboratives, connects with existing program strategies to provide a unified, integrated system of service.	▪ Minimal plan for a collaborative process and the creation of partnerships, representation of few relevant and committed key stakeholders. Limited plan to build upon existing collaboratives, to connect with existing program strategies to provide a unified, integrated system of service.	▪ Inadequate plan for a collaborative process and the creation of partnerships, inadequate representation of relevant and committed key stakeholders. Little or no plan to build upon existing collaboratives, or to connect with existing program strategies.
▪ Effective use of public resources, combining or coordinating all relevant federal, state, and local programs and community efforts. Effectively addresses coordination with existing co-curricular and extra-curricular programs with collaborative effort to increase the rate of participation in extended learning opportunities beyond the school day.	▪ Solid plan for the effective use of public resources, combining or coordinating all relevant federal, state, and local programs. If other co-curricular and extra-curricular program(s) serve students in their school, identifies issues and plan for resolving them.	▪ Minimal plan for the effective use of public resources, plan lacks the ability to combine or coordinate all relevant federal, State and local programs including any existing after school program.	▪ Described plan demonstrates an ineffective use of public resources, plan lacks the ability to combine or coordinate all relevant federal, state and local programs.
▪ Effective plans for maintaining partnership among LEA, CBO(s), and other public or private organization(s) as appropriate for supporting program implementation.	▪ Plans for maintaining partnership between LEA, CBO(s), and other public or private organization(s) as appropriate for supporting program implementation.	▪ Minimal plan for maintaining partnership between LEA, CBO(s), and other public or private organization(s) as appropriate for supporting program implementation.	▪ Ineffective or no plan for maintaining partnership between LEA, CBO(s), and other organization(s).
▪ Effective, ongoing design for ongoing collaboration with cross-section of student population through needs assessment, program design, research and selection of program elements and the implementation and evaluation of program activities.	▪ Some evidence of collaboration with students in needs assessment, program design, research and selection of activities. Some evidence of ongoing inclusion of students in some aspects of program activities.	▪ Minimal student input on the design of the proposal. Some reference to student involvement in future evaluation of program activities.	▪ Little or no student involvement in collaboration with project partnerships
▪ Realistic, thorough and effective Sustainability Plan with sufficient resources and partners in place at implementation, with firm commitments to increase community support needed to increase student supports.	▪ Adequate Sustainability Plan with resources and partners in place at implementation, commitments of at least minimum community support necessary,	▪ Minimal evidence that Sustainability Plan demonstrates adequate resources and partners to sustain program.	▪ No Sustainability Plan or plan lacks resources and partners to sustain program.

SCORING CRITERIA: RFA for California 21st Century High School After School (ASSETs) Program, Cohort 2, 2003-04

Program Administration

The application is to explicitly describe the extent to which the program is established pursuant to the California Education Code, Sections 8420-8428, and is designed to be coordinated with the local single plan for student achievement (SPSA).

Advanced (4)	Adequate (3)	Below or Partially Adequate (2)	Inadequate (0-1)
▪ Effective demonstration that applicant organization has considerable experience or the promise of success in providing educational and related activities that will complement and enhance the academic performance, achievement and positive youth development of the students.	▪ Demonstration that applicant organization has experience or the promise of success in providing educational and related activities that will complement and enhance the academic performance, achievement and positive youth development of the students.	▪ Applicant organization has minimal experience or an unclear promise of success in providing educational and related activities that will complement and enhance the academic performance, achievement and positive youth development of the students.	▪ Applicant organization has not demonstrated experience or a promise of success in providing educational and related activities that will complement and enhance the academic performance, achievement and positive youth development.
▪ Identification of effective, evidence-based, and varied activities to be provided in relation to the framework of principles for positive youth development.	▪ Identification of a limited number of effective, evidence-based, and varied activities to be provided that are relevant to the framework of principles for positive youth development.	▪ Minimal indication that activities to be provided are effective; limited indication that they are relevant to the framework of principles for positive youth development.	▪ Activities to be provided are not effective, evidence-based, or varied and lack relevance to the framework of principles for positive youth development.
▪ Assurance that the program will take place in a safe and easily accessible facility.	▪ Assurance that the program will take place in a safe and easily accessible facility.	▪ Minimal assurance that program will be in safe, easily accessible facility.	▪ Lack of assurance that program will be in safe, easily accessible facility.
▪ Assurance that transportation issues associated with safe student travel to and from the program has been thoroughly and effectively addressed.	▪ A plan that transportation issues associated with safe student travel to and from the program will be addressed	▪ Transportation issues associated with safe student travel to and from the program minimally addressed	▪ Transportation plan associated with safe student travel to and from the program is inadequate.
▪ Effective and efficient plan for disseminating information about the program to the community in a manner that is understandable, accessible, and planned to increase program support.	▪ Limited plan for disseminating information about the program to the community in a manner that is understandable, accessible, and planned to maintain program support.	▪ Minimal plan to disseminate information about the program and program results to the community or is not in a manner that is understandable and accessible.	▪ Plan for disseminating information about the program to the community inefficient and not consistent with school community needs to maintain support.
▪ Effective plan for ongoing, high quality, relevant staff and volunteer development with active participation by all staff.	▪ Limited plan for ongoing, high quality, relevant staff and volunteer development with active participation by all staff.	▪ Minimal plan for staff and volunteer development with minimal participation.	▪ Inadequate plan for staff and volunteer development and participation.
▪ Strong involvement of, and communication with, regular teaching and support staff.	▪ Limited involvement of, and communication with, regular teaching and support staff.	▪ Minimal involvement of, and communication with, regular teaching and support staff.	▪ Inadequate/no involvement of, and inadequate communication with, regular teaching and support staff.
▪ Effective description of how qualified volunteers will be used, if applicant intends to include them.	▪ Limited description of how qualified volunteers will be used, if applicant intends to include them.	▪ Unclear description of how qualified volunteers will be used, if applicant intends to include them.	▪ No description of how qualified volunteers will be used, if applicant intends to include them.

SCORING CRITERIA: RFA for California 21st Century High School After School (ASSETs) Program, Cohort 2, 2003-04

Capacity for Effective Evaluation

The application is to explicitly describe the extent to which the program is designed to be coordinated with the school's single plan for student achievement and is established pursuant to the California Education Code 8420-8428.

Advanced (4)	Adequate (3)	Below or Partially Adequate (2)	Inadequate (0-1)
▪ Demonstrates capacity for providing all requested data, for providing comprehensive, rigorous evaluation of program effectiveness, both at the local level and in cooperation with CDE, including resource commitment and use of data for program improvement.	▪ Demonstrates limited capacity for providing all requested data, for providing comprehensive, rigorous evaluation of program effectiveness, both at the local level and in cooperation with CDE, including resource commitment and use of data for program improvement.	▪ Demonstrates minimal capacity for providing requested data, for providing comprehensive, rigorous evaluation of program effectiveness, both at the local level and in cooperation with CDE, including resource commitment and use of data for program improvement.	▪ Demonstrates inadequate/no capacity for providing requested data, for providing comprehensive, rigorous evaluation of program effectiveness, both at the local level and in cooperation with CDE, including resource commitment and use of data for program improvement.
▪ Demonstration that evaluation results will be used to refine, improve, and strengthen the program, and build community support.	▪ Plan demonstrates limited capacity to use evaluation results to refine, improve, and strengthen the program, and maintain community support.	▪ Plan demonstrates minimal capacity to use evaluation results to refine, improve, and strengthen the program.	▪ Plan demonstrates inadequate/no capacity to use evaluation results to refine, improve, and strengthen the program.
▪ Assurance that applicant will effectively make the evaluation results available to the public.	▪ Preliminary assurance that applicant can make the evaluation results available to the public upon request.	▪ Minimal assurance that applicant can make the evaluation results available to the public upon request	▪ No assurance that applicant can make the evaluation results available to the public upon request.
▪ Demonstrates plan for effective periodic sharing, analysis and discussion with youths and community stakeholders about the local evaluation data collection for the 21st Century ASSETs program in order to gain input for improvements and celebrations.	▪ Effort to incorporate some sharing and discussion with youths and community stakeholders about the local evaluation data collection for the ASSETs program with possible benefits to program improvements.	▪ Minimal effort to establish effective routine to incorporate discussion with youths or community stakeholders about the local evaluation data collection for the ASSETs program with possible benefits to program improvements.	▪ Minor or no evidence of plan to incorporate discussion with youths or community stakeholders about the evaluation data collection for the ASSETs program.

SCORING CRITERIA: RFA for California 21st Century High School After School (ASSETs) Program, Cohort 2, 2003-04

Capacity to Demonstrate Cost Effectiveness

The application is to explicitly describe the extent to which the complexity of the proposed program design and the proposed budget are connected to address cost-effectiveness of the program. Also, the application is to describe growth in student participation over time.

Advanced (8)	Adequate (6)	Below or Partially Adequate (4)	Inadequate (0-2)
▪ Efforts to address cost effectiveness are clearly specified in plan—in plans related to building participation rates and additional funding sources.	▪ Some evidence is included in plan to address cost effectiveness —found within plans related to building participation rates and additional funding sources.	▪ Minimal plan for addressing cost effectiveness is included; minimal reference made to adequate plan to build participation rates and sustainable funding sources.	▪ Cost effectiveness of services for students is not addressed. Evidence is lacking or questionable related to plan to build participation rates and sustainable funding sources.
▪ Projected costs per student per day are clearly justified in relation to complexity of program design.	▪ Projected costs per student per day are justified in relation to program design.	▪ Projected costs per student per day are minimally justified in relation to program design.	▪ Projected costs per student per day are inadequately justified.
▪ Plan strongly indicates that costs per student per day will decrease across time with increased student and partnership involvement.	▪ Costs per student per day are justified and are planned to decrease across time.	▪ Costs per student per day are minimally addressed with no plan to decrease across time.	▪ Costs per student per day are inadequately justified.
▪ Realistic budgetary projections with clear effort to develop a contingency plan.	▪ Preliminary budgetary projections with documentation of some effort to develop a contingency plan.	▪ Little evidence of budgetary projections with little effort to develop a contingency plan.	▪ No evidence of budgetary projections or contingency plan.
▪ Program design and budget are well connected and highly cost-effective, with clear action plan to increase numbers of students actively involved and to decrease average costs per student per day across time.	▪ Program design and budget are connected and somewhat cost-effective, with action plan to increase numbers of students involved and to decrease average costs per student per day across time.	▪ Program design and budget are not well connected. Minimal evidence of attention to improving cost-effectiveness across time.	▪ Connections between program design and budget are not provided or clearly cost-ineffective.